

## **REMARKS:**

In the above amendment, claims 1-16 have been cancelled. New claims 17-28 have been added among which claims 17-23 are independent claims.

### **Specification**

The specification is objected to, and a substitute specification is requested by the Examiner. Applicants hereby submit the substitute specification attached at Tab A. The corrections made to the specification are to correct grammatical inconsistencies and improve syntax and thus believed to include no new matter. To comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.125(b)(2), Applicants also submit a marked-up copy of the substitute specification attached at Tab B showing the matter being added to and the matter being deleted from the specification of record. It is believed that the attached substitute specification obviates the objections to the original specification.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the above amendment, claim 7 has been cancelled.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa. Claims 2-5 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Colyer et al. Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Zey et al.

Yoshikawa is directed to inputting, storing and displaying schedule information only. (see, for example, Abstract). There is nothing in Yoshikawa which discloses or suggest a request for approval, examination or approval or determining at least one circulation route for a respective request in the application through which the application is to be circulated for examination of the request.


Colyer discloses registering information of an application such as a vacation request or a purchase order approval, along with schedule information. (See col. 2, lines 22-32). Colyer also discloses sending the registered information to another user, such as a manager. (See col. 2, lines 51-57) However, there is nothing in Colyer which discloses or suggest a request for approval, examination or approval or determining at least one circulation route for a respective request in the application through which the application is to be circulated for examination of the request.

Zey discloses storing information of an application or a maintenance request along with schedule information. (See, for instance, Abstract). Zey also discloses sending the stored information to another user or a maintenance administrator. (See col. 5, lines 22028). However, there is nothing in Zey which discloses or suggest a request for approval, examination or approval or determining at least one circulation route for a respective request in the application through which the application is to be circulated for examination of the request.

Thus, the subject matter recited in new claim 17 is neither disclosed nor taught by any of the cited references and should be allowable over the cited references.

Respectfully submitted,

October 30, 2006  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tadashi Horie (Reg. No. 40,437)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(312) 321-4200